

Remarks

Claim Status

Claims 1-91 were originally presented for examination in this application. In a preliminary amendment filed on May 14, 2004, Applicants cancelled claims 41-91. A restriction requirement was issued on February 14, 2006, and Applicants elected claims 26-40 in response thereto. An Office Action was issued on April 7, 2006, rejecting claims 26-40. In response, Applicants submitted an Amendment and Response on July 5, 2006, in which claims 26 and 34-37 were amended and new claims 92-106 were added. A Final Office Action issued on October 23, 2006, rejecting all pending claims. In conjunction with a Request for Continued Examination, Applicants filed a response to the Final Office Action in which claims 26, 37, 98, 99 and 101 were amended to address the pending rejections and to further clarify and describe the invention with greater particularity. An Office Action issued on May 10, 2007, rejecting all claims. In response, Applicants amended claim 26 to address these rejections and to further clarify and describe the invention with greater particularity. A Final Office Action issued on January 18, 2008 in which:

- Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant's regard as the invention. Applicants have amended claim 26 to address this rejection.
- Claims 26-39, 92-95, 97, 98 and 101-106 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087275 to Kim et al. (“Kim”).
- Claims 40, 96, 99 and 100 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in light of Kim in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0198858 to Stanley et al. (“Stanley”).

Applicant is filing an Appeal Brief concurrently with this amendment and response, and has amended claim 26 to simplify the issues on appeal. No new matter has been added. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 26

In response to the rejection of claim 26, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant has amended this claim and respectfully submits that the above amendments sufficiently address the rejections.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that, in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph has been fully addressed. If, in the Examiner's opinion, a telephonic interview would expedite the favorable prosecution of the present application, the undersigned attorney would welcome the opportunity to discuss any outstanding issues and to work with the Examiner toward placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 17, 2008

Electronic signature: /Joel E. Lehrer/

Joel E. Lehrer
Reg. No. 56,401
Attorney for Applicants
Customer No. 051414
Goodwin | Procter LLP
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1057
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231